

REMARKS

Claims 11, 12, 81 and 92-96 are pending in the application, with claims 11, 12, 81 and 95 being independent. Claims 11, 12, 81 and 92-94 have been amended and claims 95 and 96 have been added. Support for the amendments and the new claims may be found in Fig. 9 and the accompanying text. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 11, 12, 81 and 92-94 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koyama (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0048408) in view of Sundaresan (U.S. Patent No. 5,016,070). With respect to claims 11 and 81, and their dependent claims, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Koyama, Sundaresan, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests “a plurality of first switches, wherein each of the plurality of first switch circuits is configured to select one of one pair of current circuits among the plurality of pairs of current circuits” and “a plurality of second switches, wherein each of the plurality of second switch circuits is configured to select the other one of the one pair of current circuits among the plurality of pairs of current circuits,” as recited in claims 11 and 81.

The rejection indicates that Koyama shows a plurality of pairs of current source circuits in Fig. 5B. While applicants do not agree that Fig. 5B of Koyama shows a current source circuit, applicants note that, even assuming for sake of argument it did, Koyama, in Fig. 5B or elsewhere, does not describe or suggest the recited first switches and second switches. Sundaresan similarly fails to do so.

With respect to claim 12, and its dependent claim, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Koyama, Sundaresan, nor any proper combination of the two describes or suggests an arrangement in which “the first and second switches are configured to be controlled based on a same latch pulse,” as recited in amended claim 12. For example, even assuming for sake of argument that the rejection is correct in indicating that Fig. 5B shows a first switch and Fig. 6 shows a second switch, Koyama does not describe or suggest having the two switches controlled based on the same latch pulse, either in Figs. 5B and 6 or elsewhere. Sundaresan similarly fails to do so.

Dependent claims 92-94 have been amended to recite "wherein each of the plurality of pairs of current source circuits is configured to control an output current value depending on a voltage between the gate and the source of the transistor of the pair of current source circuits that is generated by supplying a signal current to the transistor while **the gate and the drain of the transistor are electrically connected to each other**," which was previously recited in independent claims 11, 12 and 81. While the rejection indicates that Sundaresan shows this feature in Fig. 1, applicants disagree, as Fig. 1 of Sundaresan does not show any transistors having gates and drains electrically connected to one another.

For at least these reasons, the rejections should be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The \$130 fee for the one-month extension of time is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1/29/10


John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37640

Customer No. 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945